

| | | |
|---|----------------------------------|---------------------|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| | 10/656,436 | WILSON, DENNIS RAY |
| | Examiner Daniel P. Stephenson | Art Unit 3672 |

All Participants:

Status of Application: allowed

(1) Daniel P. Stephenson.

(3) Nate Barnes.

(2) Elisabeth Evert.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 12/6/05

Time: 10:30 am

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____.

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: It was related to the applicant that the case was in condition for allowance except for some minor issues with the claims. Claims 34 and 35 were invalid because they were trying to redefine a limitation that was already defined in independent claim 7 from which they depended. Applicant requested that these claims be changed to be dependant from claim 27 instead of claim 7. In addition, the applicant requested the addition of 2 additional claims that added limitations to claim 27. These claims would state the subject matter of claims 32 and 33 but be dependent from claim 27. The examiner agreed to add these claims with the examiner's amendment to further prosecution of the case.